

# **The Evaluation of ‘Hybrid’ Employees at Morehead State University: An Analysis of History, Policies, and Practice with Recommendations**

A report of the ad-hoc committee called by Interim Provost Bob Albert to recommend evaluation protocols for ‘hybrid’ employees at Morehead State University

June 5, 2020

## **Introduction**

During the winter of 2019-2020, Interim Provost Bob Albert contacted Dr. David Long of the College of Education, and chair of the Faculty Senate Evaluation Committee to lead a special ad-hoc effort to study and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of ‘hybrid’ employees at MSU who both were university staff members and also taught in some capacity. The committee was made up of both staff members and faculty, along with an additional added member from the target population—the ‘hybrid’ employees for which we would be making evaluation recommendations. In addition to Dr. Long, the other committee members were:

Dr. Michael Hail, Professor of Government

Tom Kmetz, Librarian

Shana Savard-Hogge, Senior Accountant-Grants and Contracts

Laura Rucker, Retention Specialist and Academic Advisor

Craig Davidson, Retention Specialist and Eagle Success Program Coordinator

Rachel Frizzell, Human Resource Generalist

Rebecca Scott, Costume Shop Supervisor and Instructor of Theater

The brief report that follows is organized into three sections; 1) the background and policy context by which faculty and staff have their work types delineated at MSU, 2) current practices at the university regarding faculty teaching duties, and instances where staff have been assigned teaching duties and the growth of this sector at the university, and 3) recommendations for future practice per the committee’s view, and input from the University Senate and Staff Congress. All work for this report took place between December 2019, and June 2020.

## **I .Background and Policy**

Morehead State University has in policy and practice recognized two basic types of employees in standing full-time position categories: 1. Faculty and 2. Staff. These are defined under university policy in PG-3 and PAC-1. **There is no defined position called "hybrid" or "fractionalized" under University policy or state law.** Of the two classes of employees that do exist under policy, the ones in what are called "hybrid" or "fractionalized" positions are

clearly staff when one considers the university policies and applicable state laws that define and govern the definition of university faculty. Not only does PG-3 and PAC-1 clearly provide distinct definition, but the very organization of personnel policies follows the structure of faculty and staff categories.

Faculty positions correlate to a faculty roster number and a distinct request, search, and contract results. None of those policies and procedures were followed in hiring the current employees called hybrid" or "fractionalized." Faculty positions have clear delineations (like a nine-month base) and are distinctive in ways like ability to earn tenure, and tenure is a property right defined under Kentucky law having no association with any personnel but those holding academic rank and faculty title of appointment.

Staff are allowed to teach courses, but must have the permission of the academic program faculty and administrators. Staff who teach are adjuncts in academic programs and should receive adjunct pay for additional duties. **The University policies have historically been followed in this manner, but current practice has varied despite no basis in law or policy.**

Morehead State University maintains formal personnel policies under which types of personnel are defined. These policies are developed and maintained by Human Resources according to this policy statement:

The Director of Human Resources is responsible for maintaining the manual of personnel policies approved by proper authorities. Future revisions of existing personnel policies or the development of new policies may be proposed by University personnel. Copies of policies affecting staff employees will be submitted to the Director of Human Resources. Policies affecting faculty employees will be submitted directly to the President by the Faculty Senate for appropriate administrative review. However, in accordance with Section 12.2.c. of the Morehead State University Board of Regents By-Laws, the President of the University is responsible "to develop rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes expressed herein;" therefore, the President may modify, suspend, or develop personnel policies as the President deems such modification, suspension of policy, or development of new policy to be in the best interest of the University, subject to the Board of Regents' ratification at the next regularly scheduled Board of Regents meeting. Policies favorably acted upon will be included in the policy manual when they become effective.

Since formalized by the MSU BOR in 1985, PG-1 and PG-3 have maintained clear categorical definitions for faculty and staff. PG-3 states: "Full-Time Standing Appointments may be used for all four payroll classification categories namely: 1) Academic; 2) Administrative; 3) Staff Exempt; and 4) Staff Nonexempt." The first category are academic appointments and, in some cases, the second category, and these together are the faculty types of employment. There are many ways to identify if the appointment is faculty, and these include, but are not limited to: 1. It is a faculty roster position in academic affairs; 2. It has a clearly defined 9-month faculty base salary; 3. It holds tenure or is tenure track as defined in PAC-27 and PAC-35 and KRS 164 and KRS 161; 4. Hold an academic rank with title according to PAC-1. If an employee does not have the clear delineations for classification as faculty, as reflected in these examples of policy, they are staff.

Evaluation of faculty is governed by PAC-27, PAC-30, and PAC-35. The tenured faculty in the discipline of the faculty member as organized in academic units of professors, reviews the non-tenured faculty through a procedural document published by the Provost each year as the

“personnel action calendar.” If an MSU employee is not evaluated through this process, they are not faculty as the policies and procedures define them and this can be identified clearly as faculty are evaluated in defined specific ways.

Evaluation of staff is governed by PG-50. Evaluation is conducted annually by the staff supervisor. The university has long had staff engage in teaching and MSU policy reflects that in PSE-11, where staff engaged in teaching are compensated for work beyond the staff position they hold. PSE-11 should be followed for "hybrid" or "fractionalized" positions as they are clearly staff.

For historical context, consider the example of how twenty years ago, Dr. Eaglin and Dr. Moore were consulted for guidance on the very question of how a staff member (full-time, standing, 12-month position) could teach a course in their discipline. It was made clear that such personnel had a full-time position and instruction was in addition to that and would need to be compensated. Additionally, faculty in the discipline were to give consent to an adjunct appointment and the faculty in the discipline would be consulted by the department chair prior to scheduling of courses even after consent for an adjunct appointment. This was the practice for staff engaged in teaching as a matter of policy and practice and there have been no changes until recent years. These changes came by variation in practice and not through policy changes (which remain in these regards as they have been).

Whether through the hiring process and advertised position, or through the contract and job title classification, one can identify the academic rank faculty positions distinctly. There are defined ways to evaluate employees who are faculty and those who are staff. Faculty have defined workload in PAC-29 and faculty evaluation is governed by PAC-27, PAC-30, and PAC-35. Evaluation of staff is governed by PG-50.

The "hybrid" or "fractionalized" positions are clearly staff, despite recent practice to define instruction as part of the staff position they hold. This is problematic under current practice as faculty have no role in the peer review process of hiring or evaluating positions with teaching duties. This practice of "fractionalized" positions does not conform to sound principles of shared governance and does not conform to university policy as defined in PG-3 and PAC-1.

## **II. Current Teaching Evaluation Practice at Morehead State**

From early meetings with Provost Albert in the winter of 2019-20, he communicated that the committee's charge would be to make recommendations for the evaluation of 'hybrid' employees concerning the evaluation of their teaching. Provost Albert expressed an understanding that existing teaching evaluation practices across the diversity of employment types that the university has put into practice was lacking. When asked about how the situation came to be, Provost Albert was frank, summarizing that "it's a mess", and explained that the lack of regularly timed evaluations for all teaching categories was a problem he was looking to begin rectifying. As interim Provost, Dr. Albert inherited the system we have. That being said, the committee also considered it a sign of positive progress that clear efforts were being taken by the Provost's office to triage and improve practice. In these regards, the committee would be working to gain a clearer picture of what 'is' current practice, regardless of what 'ought' to be, respective of the policy history detailed above in Section I, and going forward to make recommendations to better realign practice with policy.

Early deliberations of the committee found that, paralleling the Provost's concern, there was much frustration from some staff constituents regarding the current evaluation of their teaching duties, but not in all cases. Some staff expressed concern or reticence that their teaching duties would take on new scrutiny or possibly be jeopardized. This concern was discussed and a consensus emerged that we would be improving practice by recommending better evaluations of teaching.

### **Understanding teaching evaluation practice at Morehead State**

The evaluation of teaching at Morehead State has, like most other U.S. colleges and universities, been a combination of two forms of assessment. Firstly, students evaluate courses with the use of, historically, optical scan bubble sheets that record the performance of the course instructor on a battery of Likert-Type scale questions. In the case of MSU, in recent years this has been through end-of-course IDEA forms, and with the Fall 2019 term, a switch to a different provider—SmartEvals. In recent years, the research on these assessments have been rife with criticism at their drawbacks and even their propagation of inequities (Fan et.al., 2019). These student assessments of classroom teaching are *not* part of this analysis, per charge of the committee.

Secondly, the other chief form of evaluation of classroom teaching, and the object of this committee's inquiry, is through a supervisor directly observing teaching practice by an instructor, annotating observations for analysis, and reporting these back to the instructor, usually pointing out areas of strength and areas that can be improved upon, usually with recommendations. While there are many instruments that such an observer might use (see Appendix I. for MSU samples) and this certainly differs from college to college respectful of the differences of the scope, needs, and style of professional practice, the core commitment—and our area of focus—is that teaching is improved by a professionally appropriate, informed outsider observing teaching and making direct commentary on practice. In this way, this is much like a coach observing live practice and giving helpful feedback to improve a stance, a throw, positioning, etc. In this view of teaching evaluation, actual practice is seen as an embodied practice in three-dimensional space, with attention to the sociality of that space. While MSU does have online asynchronous classes, the 'hybrid' instructors under our purview exists almost entirely in service of face to face courses. Evaluation models for asynchronous or synchronous online courses are therefore left out of this report.

When charged with recommending evaluation protocols for 'Hybrid' employees, Provost Albert shared both existing types of employee performance evaluations for staff (see Appendices II and III for the non-administrative staff and administrative staff instruments). These instruments, developed by Human Resources for the purpose of staff evaluation do contain a section toward the end of the instrument that has multiple options for evaluating teaching. Analysis of these instruments discloses a limitation of them—actual observation of teaching practice is but one of many ways teaching could be evaluated. These evaluation options on the current instrument include:

- 1) Student Evaluations of Teaching
- 2) Observation of Face-to-Face Teaching Methods
- 3) Observation through Remote Technology (e.g., video)
- 4) Observation of Online or Distance Learning Teaching Methods

- 5) Personal Interview
- 6) Department Faculty Evaluation Plan (FEP)

It should be noted that evaluation of teaching from forms of self-report are wildly susceptible to bias. This isn't to say that self-report is without any merit, but in the case of course instructors who have little or no pedagogical training or opportunities to have had guided reflections on that work, teaching evaluation by self-report is rife for abuse.

## Methodology and Data Collection

To make recommendations for best practice for the evaluation of 'hybrid' staff who teach in some capacity, the committee first decided that a better picture of existing teaching evaluation practices at MSU should be investigated. This would serve two purposes; 1) to provide a set of 'background' norms by which the evaluation of 'hybrid' staff teaching could be aligned in the case of staff currently teaching, and 2), provide a clearer picture of places where teaching evaluation is currently inconsistent, inappropriate, or not being conducted meaningfully at all. As the committee suspected, if the vast majority of those teaching outside the faculty categories of tenured, tenure-track, or full time instructors were essentially never meaningfully evaluated for their teaching, drawing special evaluatory judgement on 'hybrid' instruction then would stand out as special attention, if equal concern was not levied for *any* person teaching *any* class. The latter few points of concern were an emergent dimension based upon the committee's conversations and the committee's shared awareness of highly repetitive anecdotes to this point across the university.


With this framework decided, we set out to gain a clearer picture of teaching evaluations across the university with these tiers of concern to afford us a picture of normative practice by which to make recommendations:

Evaluation Group	Current evaluation norms
Tenured Faculty	None
Tenure Track Faculty	Yearly evaluation, peer and supervisor
Full Time Instructors	Yearly evaluation, supervisor
All others (mostly staff) teaching in any capacity	Staff evaluation form teaching section, no direct observation

By delineating this picture of current practice, 'hybrids', who would be by functional definition both instructors and staff, do not fall neatly in the categories led by both PG and PAC language set forth in Section I of this report. As such, the committee was also dutifully concerned whether the 'hybrids' as identified on the list supplied by the Provost's office (see Appendix IV.) was a comprehensive list. This concern emerged upon the committee's review of the list, and deliberation as to whether others existed who met the 'hybrid' category.

To gain the picture we saw best affording us the data and perspective to begin to make judgments toward a set of recommendations, the committee needed to gain a greater picture of anyone teaching in any capacity outside tenured, tenure-track, or instructor status at the university. To gain this picture, committee member Rachell Frizzell requested a search of employees in Human Resources records who met this criteria. The generated list was some 68 people (Appendix V.), of whom some but not all were an overlap with the list supplied by the Provost's office. As a committee, we realized that depending on how and where university records were held, our search would likely be a fairly complete picture. That said, there were almost certainly people who taught who were in highly idiosyncratic positions which we would not capture<sup>1</sup>. As we were not attempting an exhaustive search for every case of someone teaching, but rather an indicative picture by which to make judgements, we found this to be an acceptable pathway forward.

The committee employed a snowball sampling methodology (Morgan, 2008) of person-to-person reference contacts, the social science equivalent of the epidemiological method of "contact tracing" to identify all possible teaching conditions. This method involved the committee breaking up the Human Resources list of individual instructors linked by academic supervisor, checking on the validity of our list, and then checking on the extent of teaching by each staff member ( $n$  = courses taught per year) via the report of supervisors under their purview along with the teaching evaluation practices actually in place in each case.



While we aimed for an exhaustive search of university employees in question with our starting data set of these 68 people, the Spring 2019 Covid 19 disease pandemic interceded in our work. While we estimate that we have about 80% of this data collected, we feel confident that the gaps in the data do not skew the overall picture. During data collection and initial analysis, an early analytic picture emerged quickly and held true through additional data collection. The picture was not overly complex in the majority of cases.

## Findings

Data collection both quickly confirmed the internal validity of the human resources list (albeit limited), and also added a number of additional staff who are also teaching outside the bounds of the list (see Appendix V. highlights). All discussion refers to the data from Appendix V, which we will speak about both in by specific issue that emerges from the data, and also in summary to provide recommendations.

***Finding 1: staff who teach, in their many conditions, are almost entirely never functionally evaluated for the quality of their teaching.*** As a quick scan of the Appendix V.

<sup>1</sup> An additional comparative analysis using Institutional Research data might also lend a good comparative look at every instance of teaching at MSU. This was outside the committee's agreed upon early plan and became salient later in our work process.

shows, although we are not entirely complete in data collection, apart from a handful of teaching evaluations conducted in the College of Education mainly with staff teaching in the Master of Arts in Teaching program, staff are never evaluated for the quality of their teaching. If we are to turn to non-tenured/tenure-track/or full time instructors for models of teaching evaluation options, we find ourselves sorely lacking. Even in the case of the few ‘hybrids’ in the COE who were evaluated, the evaluation rate was once in two to three years, which seems a sparse attempt at best.

During the process of data collection, we had numerous opportunities to spot-check the reasoning and rationales of when and why teaching does not get evaluated. The following three vignettes are good examples for the broader issues that we saw forestalling the evaluation of teaching from taking place.

- In an affable conversation about their employee’s evaluation, a department chair had to think a bit when asked about the evaluation of their instructors. After some moments pause, the chair was forthright in their recollection that they never really quite got to it, but intended to.
- Another instance was at least a function of crossed communication regarding evaluation duties, and for one of the two parties involved, no evaluation was conducted due to the chair knowing that there was no specific requirement for direct observation of teaching within the evaluation criteria of the staff evaluation form. The first of these two people share oversight for employees who both exist in a fairly specialized technical work environment, and also periodically teach. The supervisor of the technical work was clear when approached as to who would do teaching evaluation, “oh, the chair does that for these guys”, whereas upon discussing the matter with the chair, the issue was clear, “they’re staff...they don’t get evaluated for their teaching”.
- The next vignette is one which created a bit of internal tension within the committee, as the person in question’s long standing job contained a significant amount of teaching, but in their self-report they had never been directly evaluated for their teaching in sixteen years. This was salient, as internal committee discussion came to disclose that the committee itself, by virtue of what it was highlighting, might bring closer scrutiny upon, or potentially even jeopardize this arrangement. The committee aired this concern and underscored among the members that the intention of the work was for improvement in all quarters, and not to single out specific cases.

***Finding 2: more than a third of all staff who teach, teach in at least one section or multiple sections of First Year Seminar, and their teaching is never evaluated.*** Faculty and administration close to discussions of the First Year Seminar (FYS) program at MSU know that the course model and implementation have seen changes in both scope and purpose in the last few years. In earlier iterations, FYS was a class that introduced students to the scholarly pursuits of reading and research. It was designed and organized by motivated faculty with the goal, at least in part paralleling national norms, to motivate students the ‘big questions’ that drive interest in liberal arts and professional subjects, and thus point students at majors. This model has been replaced in recent years by an administratively driven ‘introduction to college’ class that focuses on content organized around practical matters of college student success via the lens of student support services. Both models are common across U.S. campuses now, but as Porter and Swing detail (2006), they serve dramatically different purposes. Depending on the social class of the

students involved, different types of first year experiences may be more appropriate in some cases than others.

While a critique of FYS is outside the purview of this report, the implementation of FYS, at least *to the extent that teaching quality is both monitored and evaluated*, has been shown to not exist. As a number of reports to committee members have shown, the evaluation of teaching has not been made a part of the program, apart from student IDEA and SmartEvals metrics (which are not the focus of this report). A few of the interviews for this project to this point are telling. In speaking with a staff member regarding how their FYS teaching was evaluated, and in concordance with the experience of other staff teaching FYS we spoke to, their response was telling in both body language and tone:

It's not evaluated...when I sat down with [my supervisor] and we got to the section on the performance review about teaching, it was weird. [They're] a really nice person, but when we looked on the part of the evaluation, [they] just started asking me how the class went, and didn't really give me much feedback other than to move on.

For this effort, the staff member's teaching was not meaningfully evaluated. We, as a university community can and should do better.

David Long's interview with Michelle Barber, who heads the evaluation of FYS staff, corroborated this approach to the evaluation of teaching. As it was explained during the interview, faculty input<sup>2</sup> was gathered during the design of the current iteration of FYS, and a comprehensive training program was delivered in the summer to prepare staff to teach. In numerous instances during out data collection, staff pointed complaints about the quality of the preparation, as it amounted to a long, guided, didactic look at PowerPoint presentations they would implement, with little practical advice for either the types of pedagogical strategies they would employ, or how they would practice them. This became a concern as many of the staff teaching FYS seemed to elicit a sense of fear that any critique they brought to the shortcomings of the FYS program might put at least part of their job in jeopardy. FYS then, as currently administered and implemented, is not a good model for teaching evaluation standards for 'hybrid' staff.

***Finding 3: Whoever a 'hybrid' employee is, we're not sure, the employees are not sure, and many instances of inconsistency abound in this employment status.*** This was one of the most salient issues among staff assigned to the committee when they discussed just exactly who was a hybrid, who was not, and how consistently such terms were used and by whom. By any reasonable means, this is not a desirable nor tenable state of affairs. As the following indicative vignette from a committee member makes clear, the understanding of who a 'hybrid' is, is not consistent across the university.

When we went to interview supervisors for this committee, I had two different supervisors who I asked if there was any hybrid under their supervision who was NOT on our list. The two different supervisors said no, but when asked about employees who I

---

<sup>2</sup> A small number of faculty were consulted in the initial design of the most recent two versions of FYS. As best as this committee knows, no other faculty input has been involved in the current running of the FYS program. This administrative 'capture' of the FYS program's academic content should be examined by Faculty Senate per SACSCOC Standards.



just happened to know were hybrids, or thought they might be, both of these supervisors were surprised. One had “forgot” about their person. The other wasn’t sure if that employee was a hybrid or not, and asked the employee questions to determine their classification.

The committee found no external norm within the higher education literature concerning the establishment of ‘hybrid’ positions, but did find instances of other universities struggling with similar kinds of employment statuses as practice has drifted away from the established policies at respective institutions. Thus, the committee became non-committal as to the ontological status of such a distinction, and whether it would hold up if pressed legally. In fact, as work continued, it became clear that devising an evaluation model for ‘hybrids’ teaching was less a problem of instrumentation, and more a problem of personnel not being compelled or committing to actually conducting the evaluations.

To begin to draw some internal clarity to this situation, it’s worth outlining some known distinctions within existing Human Resources protocols, and then begin to compare this to the Faculty / Staff cleft drawn up in section one. Currently, three hybrid instructional criteria were teased from the data gathered from HR records.

- **Instructional Assignment-** Instructional assignment not included in the job description of the employee. Assignment allows a release from some duties in a stated job description allowing work on instructional assignment. Institutional Base Salary is not adjusted.
- **Joint Appointment-** Instructional assignment is included in the job description of the employee. Compensation level is adjusted on Institutional Base Salary to include this appointment type with a portion of salary coming from an instructional fund source.
- **Supplemental Assignment-** Instructional assignment not included in the job description of the employee. Assignment above and beyond the Institutional Base Salary for duties considered separate and distinct from the employee’s primary position. Assignment is compensated at normal adjunct rate. (Referencing UAR 140.02 “Supplemental Salary for Faculty and Staff from Sponsored Programs” for consistency in establishing guidelines).

These internal distinctions are important, as the committee saw each one of them in practice, but perhaps less the case with ‘Supplemental Assignment’, to be models for ‘hybrid’ employees.

**Given that the background context by which a ‘hybrid’ employee has been historically identified is not clear in statute or in deliberate, consistent practice at the university, we remain non-committal to suitability of such distinctions and implore the administration to realign internal practice with PG and PAC language and advise the Faculty Senate and Staff Congress to insist on their enforcement.**

Ultimately, the assignment of instruction to staff should be only under unavoidable circumstances or truly idiosyncratic ‘best option’ circumstances, with an eye to returning teaching duties to full-time instructors, tenure-track, or tenured faculty, per these guidelines for Human Resources and Academic Affairs. In reference to the three bulleted assignment categories above, the following five criteria should be adhered to.

1. These criteria are utilized in future instructional assignments.

2. These criteria will be compared against ERP system data to determine adherence to standard definitions.
3. When changes occur to instructional assignments in the future, compensation criteria will be maintained.
4. Supplemental assignments should be temporary in nature. If a supplemental assignment persists, evaluation of instructional void should occur.
5. Master list be maintained by the Provost Office. All departments involved in data collection or dissemination have the ability to access information.

As per other findings sections, an indicative case is useful in putting flesh on the armature of the problem. From a much longer narrative of the problems of ‘hybrid’ identity, the following story from a staff member nicely encapsulates both the problems of ill-defined employment types, and also the repercussions of such types when problems arise—there is no clear model to account for both the teaching of ‘hybrids’ and their staff work:

I had a specific incident where I had filed a formal grievance against my supervisor. This was followed, shortly thereafter, by what I believe was retaliation via my FEP (Faculty Evaluation Plan). In the process of dealing with this grievance and the appeal, two things of concern came up. The first was that there was confusion about my actual classification and how to proceed with an appeal. Because there is no official “hybrid” classification, my current file showed me as instructional staff & non-instructional staff, with a faculty FEP and a faculty evaluation and the job description of faculty. At that point, early on, I was actually asked by Mr. Nally what my classification was. I had a faculty FEP and a faculty evaluation, was given the FEP/evaluation timeline for faculty, and my FEP is “based on the Music, Theatre and Dance FEP and PAc-30 guidelines”. Then later Mr. Nally asserted that I was staff and as such could not appeal my evaluation.

Needless to say, such vagaries in implementation of policy are exacerbated by having internal personnel classification distinctions which, when pushed due to legitimate personnel conflict, put the institution and all parties involved potentially in a bad light. This should be rectified.

And finally, while these three findings are certainly not the only things this committee could say about teaching evaluation procedures generally at the university in our efforts to recommend protocols for ‘hybrids’, these three encapsulate the biggest issues we currently see, within the timeframe allotted. We greatly encourage a future committee or group to take this issue up for continued monitoring and further clarification, preferably by direct oversight of the Faculty Senate and Staff Congress.

In terms of specific limitations to this effort, the ability of the committee to gather data was also hindered by lack of consistent data points. The data points were not shared across departments nor was a master list of these employees available in one central location for update and dissemination. The departments normally involved in the data collection for these data points were not always willing or able to provide adequate data.

### **III. Recommendations for evaluating ‘hybrid’ employees**

Based upon the findings of the committee, we recommend the following policies be returned to, in the case of existing regulations that have been drifted away from in practice. We

also offer advice and new ways of thinking about instructional rights and responsibilities—with an eye towards constant improvement. And finally, we implore the administration to set a clear, commonly understood timeline to bring about such changes, with all parties holding each other accountable.

1. In the case of ‘hybrid’ instructors whose teaching duties are located within a traditional academic department or center structure, the department chair or center head should be held accountable by their corresponding Dean, and ultimately the Provost for ensuring that yearly evaluations of teaching by said ‘hybrids’ is conducted in person, and include a post-teaching reflective discussion of the instructor’s strengths and areas for improvement, per the approved observation instrument of that department or center. These evaluations should take place no less than once a year per instructor.

2. These same ‘hybrid’ employees should have their teaching evaluated as a stand-alone element of their evaluation, weighted proportionally to their distribution of effort (DOE). For example, an instructor who teaches two courses per year shall have .20 percent of their DOE counted towards their overall annual performance (this is based upon the DOE equivalent of a 5/5 teaching assignment full time instructor’s proportional equivalent effort). The remaining .80 DOE for this ‘hybrid’ employee’s performance evaluation shall use the current or future iteration of the staff evaluation form. This leaves the overall evaluation to be a summary of these two parts—in this case .80 staff evaluation and .20 teaching evaluation. This will differ by instructor in question and by amount of teaching being requested or assigned.

3. ‘Hybrid’ employees who teach, but report to a superior who is not qualified to judge the efficacy of that ‘hybrid’s’ teaching will have, initiated by their superior’s request, a faculty associate of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) or future equivalent assigned for the annual evaluation of the ‘hybrid’ instructor. Responsibility of assignment and follow-through shall initiate with the supervisor, in communication with the CTL and the instructor, through the process of the evaluation cycle, with record of the evaluation residing with the chair, and the Provost’s office. These evaluations shall also occur no less than once a year per instructor. The CTL shall be, at the direction of the Provost’s office tasked with assembling a pool of evaluators who are at least able to evaluate the pedagogical efficacy of instructor’s teaching, with guidance from the initiating department chair or lead for specific ‘look for’ content-area guidance.

4. The university administration, in concert with Faculty Senate and Staff Congress, shall commit itself, for the sake of constant improvement, to the creation of a “Teaching Bill of Rights” policy which would list a minimal set of protections or standardized due process for anyone who teaches regardless of rank for classification, respective of items 1-3 above. This policy change would acknowledge the existing drift away from codified regulations with a concerted effort to return in good faith to implement a set of minimal expectations that are universal, set in policy, and communicated to all.

5. As stated earlier, the assignment of instruction to staff should be only under unavoidable circumstances or truly idiosyncratic ‘best option’ circumstances, with an eye to returning teaching duties to full-time instructors, tenure-track, or tenured faculty, per these guidelines for Human Resources and Academic Affairs. In lieu of that ideal, the five criteria listed on pages 9-

10 of this report shall be adhered to in practice. To that end, the designation of ‘hybrid’ employees will dissolve as a salient issue, as any staff member, respective of recommendations 1-4 above, shall receive at least yearly, face to face evaluation of their teaching.

Final general note: While the committee endeavored to contact as many employees and possible, it also should be noted that any additional efforts to further refine these findings should include a cross-check of both Human Resources and Institutional Research records. To that end, the committee sees this work and these recommendations as a *starting point* to improve practice, not a summative comment. We implore the MSU Administration, the Faculty Senate, and the Staff Congress to work together to continue to better realign actual practices at the university with existing regulations.

### References:

- Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PloS one*, 14(2), e0209749. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0209749>
- Morgan, D. (2008) Snowball Sampling. In: Given, L., Ed., *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, SAGE Publications Inc., Thousand Oaks, 816-817.
- Porter, S.R., Swing, R.L. (2006) Understanding How First-year Seminars Affect Persistence. *Research in Higher Education* 47, 89–109 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-005-8153-6>

**Appendix I. Examples of Classroom Teaching Evaluation Forms**

**FEP Classroom Evaluation Sheet**

Professor:

Date:

Class:

Location:

Time:

ORGANIZATION:

DELIVERY TECHNIQUES:

MULTIMEDIA USE:

PROPER CONCEPTS:

.

PROPER LEVEL:

ENCOURAGE THINKING SKILLS:

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS:

## **Procedure for the Assessment of Teaching by Chair (or Chair's representative)**

**For each course you would like to have assessed the following is required (in paper format):**

- Syllabus.
- Any PowerPoint slides, handouts, etc. used during the specific lecture.
- Sample exam that has been used or will be used.

**A written statement (email is okay), two weeks prior to the lecture that you would like to have evaluated, asking for an assessment of the specific course with the following information:**

- Location
- Time and Day
- Topic for the day
- Course Number (Psy 154)
- Course description

**The specific lecture will be recorded and you will be given a copy of the recording before any assessment is done. If you would like to reschedule send an email with the same course information.**

The assessment will be performed using the following form (Chair's assessment of Teaching) CAT form.

### Chair's Assessment of Teaching (CAT) Form

Instructor:

Course:

Approx. # of Students at Class that Day:

Lecture Date:

Observer:

Please rate each item by placing an 'X' through the numbered line at the appropriate place between or including the numbered end-points. If you think an item is not applicable, write 'NA' to the left of the item. If you have not observed the relevant activity, write 'NO' to the left of the item. Please include comments as needed.

#### I. Content Suitability

1. Relationship to course syllabus

**No Relation**

**Closely Related**

1      2      3      4      5

2. Relationship to assigned readings/homework

**Closely Related**

**Closely Related**

1      2      3      4      5

3. Value of content

**Not Useful**

**Very Valuable**

1      2      3      4      5

4. Appropriate coverage of topic(s)

**Not Appropriate**

**Appropriate**

1      2      3      4      5

5. Level of difficulty of material

**Too Easy**

**Too Difficult**

1      2      3      4      5

Comments: 3

### 3II. Lecture Organization

1. Logical sequence of topics

**Not Clear**

**Very Clear**

1 2 3 4 5

2. Pace of the lecture

**Too Slow**

**Too Fast**

1 2 3 4 5

3. Provision of summaries and syntheses

**No Provision**

**Explicit Provision**

1 2 3 4 5

4. Appropriate use of class time

**Inappropriate**

**Excellent Use**

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

### III. Clarity of Presentation

1. Definitions of new terms, concepts, principles

**None Given**

**Explicitly Clear**

1 2 3 4 5

2. Use of examples

**None Given**

**Excellent Examples**

1 2 3 4 5

3. Conveys overarching goal/direction

**Not Conveyed**

**Clearly Conveyed**

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:



#### IV. Materials and Evaluations

1. Organization of syllabus or outline

**Disorganized**

**Clearly Organized**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. Suitability of quizzes/exam

**Unsuitable**

**Very Suitable**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

Comments:

#### V. Instructor's Class Interaction

1. Questions challenge students and require them to do more than simply recall factual content

**Never**

**Quite Often**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. Engages class members in discussion

**No Discussion**

**Much Discussion**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

3. Paraphrases students' comments for clarification/reinforcement

**Never**

**Quite Often**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

4. Directs discussion that is centered on the intended topic

**Aimless**

**Very Focused**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

Comments:

## VI. Instructor's Style

1. Instructor's involvement with the topic

**Appears Bored** **Very Enthusiastic**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. Engages students in problem solving activities

**No Engagement** **Excellent Engagement**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

### 3. Encourages/reinforces student contributions

**Not Encouraged** **Very Encouraged**

1 2 3 4 5

#### 4. Students' engagement in class

**Appear Bored** **Very Attentive**

1 2 3 4 5

5. The class atmosphere is

**Very Stiff** **Appropriately Relaxed**

1 2 3 4 5

6. Personal mannerisms including gestures, voice, vocabulary, etc. are suitable

**Distracting** **Quite Suitable**

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

## VII. Summary

1. Rate this instructor's overall effectiveness

**Ineffective**

**Very Effective**

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

2. List this instructor's strengths.

3. List this instructor's weaknesses.

4. How might this instructor's effectiveness be improved?

5. Please write a paragraph summarizing your overall impression of the instructor's teaching.



### Faculty Evaluation of Didactic Teaching Practices

Faculty Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Course(s) Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/Term: \_\_\_\_\_

Distance Course: \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No Location(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluation Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Please select the number below for each statement that is most descriptive:

Ratings				
	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Agree	4 Strongly Agree
<b>All Courses</b>				
Serves as a professional role model for students.				
Demonstrates effective communication in delivery of content.				
Presents content in an organized manner.				
Encourages student interaction in the learning process.				
Provides critical thinking opportunities.				
Uses supplemental aids to effectively support content.				
Content reflective of trends in discipline.				
Course materials are consistent and reflective of course objectives.				
<b>Distance Learning Course Only</b>				
Utilizes available technology effectively.				
Visuals are easy to read and aesthetically appealing via remote distance learning site.				
Actively involves students at all distance learning sites.				
Maintains student's attention by changing the pace of the distance learning class.				
<b>Overall Rating (average the rating numbers above)</b>				

### Evaluation

Comments:

### Signature

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix A: Faculty Teaching Observation Form; Department of Biology & Chemistry

Faculty:\_\_\_Observer:\_\_\_\_\_

Course Number & Name:\_\_\_\_\_

Lab Required yes no

Location observed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date/Time of Observation:

---

Stated Daily Topic/Goal(s) for the class:

---

Circle all relevant/observed qualities in each area.

1) **Class Format:** lecture, seminar, large group activity, small group activity, individual student activity, demonstration, guided practice, media presentation, other (explain) \_\_\_\_\_

2) **Appropriate Variety of Presentation/Motivational Techniques used:** (questioned, rephrased , prompted , encouraged discussion, handouts, overheads, videos, board notes, variety, multi-media, gave good examples, class activity

Other description: \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Circle One:** Exceptional excellent very good good fair poor Comments:

---

3) **Classroom Management:** (organized, punctual, prepared, positive, efficient, good pace communicated expectations, interesting, minimized disruptions... )

---

**Circle One:** Exceptional excellent very good good fair poor Comments:

---

4) **Student Engagement:** (extent to which students are involved, intellectually, in the learning process)

---

**Circle One:** Exceptional excellent very good good fair poor Comments:

---

5) **Progress toward Achievement of Goals for the Class:**

**Circle One:** Exceptional excellent very good good fair poor Comments:

**Additional Observer's Comments:**

## Appendix II. Non-Administrative Employee Performance Evaluation




### Employee Performance Evaluation

Morehead State University  
Human Resources  
301 Howell-McDowell  
606-783-2097

Employee Name		Department		Evaluation Period	
Employee ID #		Job Title		Reviewer Name	
Employee and supervisor have reviewed and discussed the employee's current assigned job description prior to completion of the performance appraisal. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Employee Initials _____ Supervisor Initials _____					
Please rate the MSU Employee on each performance factor based on performance of the employee for the evaluation period indicated above. Evaluating Supervisor is required to provide comments for any core expectation marked as "Needs Improvement"					
<b>Excellent:</b> Consistently performs job duties; work and behavior expectations consistently met; consistently exceeded performance goals and supervisor's expectations; anticipated and took additional duties beyond major responsibilities.		<b>Successful:</b> Consistently performed job duties; work and behavior expectations consistently met; met performance goals and supervisor's expectations; completed and verified own work in a timely, accurate and thorough manner.		<b>Needs Improvement:</b> Did not consistently and/or accurately perform job duties; work and/or behavior expectations were not met; did not meet performance goals and/or supervisor's expectations; not consistently reliable in handling daily duties; requires more supervision than expected.	
The evaluating supervisor should assess the employee according to their meeting the core expectations listed below. The evaluating supervisor must rate according to the evaluation rating provided above and provide comments where required.					
<b>CORE EXPECTATIONS</b>		<b>RATING</b>		<b>EVALUATING SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS</b>	
<b>Dependability:</b> maintains a strong attendance record, is punctual, and displays a quality work ethic at all times.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<b>Job Knowledge and Skills:</b> understands concepts, methods, and techniques necessary to accomplish job duties.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<b>Communication and Attitude:</b> actively listens to supervisor and co-workers and expresses feedback effectively and in a professional manner. Maintains a positive and respectful attitude in the workplace toward others and the University.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<b>Team Oriented:</b> works effectively with others to achieve a common goal or complete a shared task. Willing to offer and receive assistance from coworkers as needed.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<b>Customer Service:</b> Demonstrates quality customer service to all students, faculty, staff and visitors of the campus.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<b>Planning and Productivity:</b> completes assigned tasks and projects within specified time. Organizes and prioritizes time and University resources appropriately.		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			

<b>Adaptability:</b> is willing to accept change and adapt to differing work processes, conditions, assignments, goals and policies.	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement		
<b>Overall Evaluation Rating</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Successful	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	
<b>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY</b> The evaluating supervisor shall determine an overall evaluations rating and provide a brief narrative that summarizes the employee's work performance, accomplishments or areas needing improvement during this evaluation period. If an overall rating is "Excellent", the evaluating supervisor must provide justification for the rating. If an overall rating of "Needs Improvement", the supervisor and employee work with Human Resources to develop an Employee Improvement Plan. Employee Improvement Plan Form is available on the Human Resources webpage.			
<b>Acknowledgement and Acceptance</b>			
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION SIGNATURES</b> The evaluating supervisor should review the evaluation with the employee and discuss the evaluation ratings. The employee's signature is verification that he/she has received the evaluation and had the opportunity to discuss it with their supervisor. The employee shall indicate whether or not they agree with the evaluation results.			
	Print Name	Signature	date
Employee			
<input type="checkbox"/> I Agree			
<input type="checkbox"/> I Disagree			
Supervisor			
Division Vice-President or Senior Supervisor			
<b>EMPLOYEE COMMENTS</b> The employee shall use the comment section below to make any comments, suggestions or requests that they wish to have accompany their evaluation. If an employee marked that they disagree with their evaluation, the space below shall be used to explain why they do not agree. Attach additional comments if needed.			





## Appendix III. Administrative Employee Evaluation



# Professional Employee Performance Evaluation

Morehead State University  
Human Resources  
301 Howell-McDowell  
606-783-2097

Employee Name		Department		Performance Year	
Employee ID #		Job Title		Evaluation Period	
<p>Please rate the MSU Employee on each performance factor based on performance of the employee for the evaluation period indicated above. <b>(Employee performance evaluations will not be used to determine merit pay increases)</b>  <b><i>Ratings of excellent and needs improvement require a statement in the comment section explaining the rating.</i></b></p>					
<p>Employee and supervisor have reviewed and discussed the employee's current assigned job description prior to completion of the performance appraisal. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>					
<p><b>Excellent:</b> Employee performs job duties above and beyond work expectations, consistently exceeded performance goals and supervisor's expectations; anticipated and took additional duties beyond major responsibilities.</p>		<p><b>Successful:</b> Consistently performed job duties; work and behavior expectations consistently met; met performance goals and supervisor's expectations; completed and verified own work in a timely, accurate and thorough manner.</p>		<p><b>Needs Improvement:</b> Did not consistently and/or accurately perform job duties; work and/or behavior expectations were not met; did not meet performance goals and/or supervisor's expectations; not consistently reliable in handling daily duties; requires more supervision than expected.</p>	
<p><b>CORE EXPECTATIONS</b> The evaluating supervisor will assess the employee according to their meeting the core expectations listed below. The evaluating supervisor must rate according to the evaluation rating provided above and provide comments where required.</p>					
<b>CORE EXPECTATIONS</b>		<b>RATING</b>		<b>EVALUATING SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS</b>	
<p><b>Job Knowledge and Skills:</b> understands concepts, methods, and techniques necessary to accomplish job duties.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<p><b>Communication:</b> actively listens, accepts and offers feedback, written materials are clear and concise.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<p><b>Planning and Productivity:</b> completes projects and assignments within specified time. Organizes and prioritizes appropriately.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<p><b>Resource Management:</b> Utilizes university resources effectively to meet operating objectives.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<p><b>Relationships with Customers, Colleagues and Coworkers:</b> provides quality customer service to all internal and external customers.</p>		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
<p><b>MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES</b> The evaluating supervisor will review the employee's job description and summarize the position's major responsibilities. Each listed major responsibility should account for at least 20% with a combined total of 100%. If necessary, minor responsibilities can be combined to equal 20%. The evaluating supervisor must rate according to the evaluation rating provided above and provide comments where required.</p>					
<b>MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES</b>		<b>RATING</b>		<b>EVALUATING SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS</b>	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement			
		<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful			

	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Successful <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	

<b>Overall Evaluation Rating</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Successful	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement

<b>PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY</b> The evaluating supervisor will determine an overall evaluation rating and provide a brief narrative that summarizes the employee's work performance, accomplishments or areas needing improvement during this evaluation period. If a rating of excellent or needs improvement is chosen, the evaluating supervisor must provide justification for the rating.

<b>Overall Evaluation Signatures</b>			
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION SIGNATURES</b> The evaluating supervisor should review the evaluation with the employee and discuss the evaluation ratings. Any ratings of needs improvement, the supervisor will provide the employee an improvement plan.			
	Print Name	Signature	Date
Employee			
Evaluating Supervisor			
Divisional Unit Supervisor			
Received by Divisional Vice President or President			
<i>If the employee chooses not to sign the performance evaluation, they should use the employee's comments section or attach additional documentation to explain the reason they do not wish to sign the evaluation.</i>			
<b>EMPLOYEE COMMENTS</b> The employee will use the comment section below to make any comments specific professional about their evaluation and supervisor. This area can also be used to explain if the employee does not wish to sign the evaluation.			

<b>GOALS</b>
--------------

The following goals have been agreed to by the employee and supervisor for the next performance evaluation period. **There must be at least three goals listed.**

1.

2.

3.

4.

Date submitted to immediate supervisor

#### **Appendix IV. List of ‘Hybrid’ Employees supplied by the Provost’s Office**

##### **Position**

1. Instructor of Space Science/Star Theater Director
2. Instructor of Education/Outreach Educator (ARDE)
3. Instructor of Art and Design/Director of Golding-Yang Art Gallery (ARDE)
4. Professor of Traditional Music/Director KCTM
5. Instructor of Music/Music Archivist (KCTM)
6. Assistant Professor of Music/Associate Director of Bands
7. Technical Director/Scene Shop Supervisor/Instructor of Theater
8. Costume Shop Supervisor/Instructor of Theater
9. Associate Professor of Music/Director of Bands
10. Instructor of History/Military Initiatives Director
11. Instructor/Facilitator (Social Work)
12. Instructor of Career and Technical Education/CTE Coordinator (SECS)
13. Professor of Education/Director of Quality Assurance and Accreditation (COE)
14. Instructor/Director Educational Unit for Child Care Services (COE)
15. Instructor/Trainer (Educational Unit for Child Care Services)
16. Instructor of Education/MAT Program Coordinator
17. Instructor of Education/Assistant MAT Program Coordinator
18. Equestrian Coach/Instructor
19. Program Coordinator/Associate Professor of Nursing
20. Assistant Program Coordinator/Professor of Nursing
21. Program Coordinator/Professor of Nursing
22. Online Nursing Programs Coordinator/Professor of Nursing
23. Coordinator of Undergraduate Research/Instructor
24. Coordinator of Education Abroad/Instructor
25. ESL Instructor/Program Coordinator
26. Degree Completion Coach/Instructor
27. Coordinator of Tutoring and Learning Services/Instructor

**Appendix V.** List of employees teaching in some capacity outside tenured, tenure-track, or full-time instructor status. The committee believes this list to close to complete, but additional efforts should complete a cross-check between Human Resources and Institutional Resources records.

Name	Job Title	Supervisor	# and ID courses taught	Was their teaching observed?	Who observed it?
Blinded for dissemination	Associate Professor of Music/Director of Bands	Brian Mason	Faculty	No	
	Instructor of Music/Music Archivist (KCTM)/Assistant Professor of Music Archivist/Associate Director of Bands	John Earnst		No	
	Technical Director/Scene Shop Supervisor/Instructor of Theater	Brian Mason	THEA210, 1 sec, plus 3-6 more hours of varying classes per semester	No	
	Professor of Traditional Music/Director KCTM	John Earnst		No	
	Costume Shop Supervisor/Instructor of Theater	Brian Mason	THEA211, 1 sec, plus 3-6 more hours of varying classes per semester	No	
	Asst. Athletic Trainer	Jamey Carver		No	
	Asst. V.P., Communications & Marketing	Jim Shaw/ Layne Neeper	COMS108, 1 sec fall	Shaw thinks Neeper should do it, Neeper thought Shaw did it	
	Asst. V.P., Alumni Relations & Development	Jim Shaw		Shaw believes teaching area should do eval	
	Coord., Education Abroad/Instructor	Laurie Couch	FYS 4/yr	No	
	Dir., Distance Ed. & Instr. Design	Laurie Couch	varies/ not every semester	No	

Coord., Undergraduate Research/Instructor	Laurie Couch	FYS 4/yr also PolSci	No	
Director, First Year Programs	Laurie Couch		No	
Director, Career Services	Laurie Couch	FYS 1/yr	No	
ESL Instructor/Program Coordinator/Degree Completion Coach/Instructor	Laurie Couch	varies/ difficult to explain	No	
Coord., Service Learning/Instructor	Laurie Couch	FYS 4/yr	No	
Director, Retention & Academic Advising	Laurie Couch?	FYS 1/yr	No	
Computer Lab Super./Mass Comm.	** John Ernst		No	
Instructor of Education/MAT Program Coordinator	April Miller	MAT courses	1 in 2-3 years	April dep instrument
Instructor of Education/Assistant MAT Program Coordinator	April Miller?	MAT courses	1 in 2-3 years	April dep instrument
Instructor/Director Educational Unit for Child Care Services (COE)/Instructor/Trainer	April Miller?	EDEC/IECE courses	1 in 2-3 years	April dep instrument
Instructor of Space Science/Star Theater Director/Instructor of Education/Outreach Educator	Ben Malphrus?	Signed up, but not taught.	n/a	
Dean, College of Education	Bob Albert		n/a ?	
Dean, Smith College of Business & Technology	Bob Albert		n/a ?	
Dean, Caudill College of Arts, Humanities & Social Science	Bob Albert		n/a ?	
Dean, College of Science	Bob Albert		n/a ?	
Water Testing Laboratory Manager	Charles Lydeard	BIO 105, once a year	No	-
Teacher Educ. Program Coord./Academic Advisor	Kim Nettleton	FYS 1 Year	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS Fall 2020 1*	No*	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-

Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist/Eagle Success Prog. Coord.	Michelle Barber	FYS 2 sec , MSU 499*	No*	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Coordinator of Tutoring and Learning Services/Instructor	Michelle Barber	FYS 4 sec, Math*	No*	-
Degree Completion Coach/Instructor	Michelle Barber	FYS 3 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Assoc. Dir., Retention & Academic Advising	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec, MSU 099*	No*	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec	No	-
Retention Specialist & Academic Advisor	Michelle Barber	FYS 1 sec, COMS 108*	No*	-
Degree Completion Coach/Instructor	Michelle Barber	FYS 3 sec	No	-
Instructional Designer	David Flora			
Asst. Dir., Scholarships/Data Specialist	Denise Trusty			
Systems & Data Manager (Registrar)	Keith Moore			
VA, Athletics Eligibility & Records Proc. Coord.	Keith Moore	COMS108 1 sec	No	
Minority Academic Services Coord.	Lora Pace			
Head Cross Country & Track Coach	Richard Flether			
Project Manager	Chris Howes			

	Professor of Education/Director of Quality Assurance and Accreditation (COE)	Chris Miller		No	
	Web & Digital Marketing Director	Jami Hornbuckle			
	Director, Internal Audits	Jay Morgan			
	Instructor of Art and Design/Director of Golding-Yang Art Gallery (ARDE)	Jeanne Petsch			
	Farm Manager	Joyce Stubbs			
	Police Supervisor (Lieutenant)	Merrell Harrison			
	Pre-Award Admin. Director (RSPR)	Michael Henson			
	Assoc. Dir., Student Activities	Russ Mast			
	TRIO Academic Coordinator	Shellie Hallock			
	TRIO Academic Coordinator	Shellie Hallock			
	Graduate Programs Completion Coord.	Susan Maxey			
	Director, Transition Services	Tim Rhodes			
	Director, MSU @ Mt. Sterling				
	Equestrian Coach/Instructor/Program Coordinator/Associate Professor of Nursing/Assistant Program Coordinator/Professor of Nursing				
	Publications Writer				
	Online Nursing Programs Coordinator/Professor of Nursing/Coordinator of Undergraduate Research/Instructor/Coordinator of Education Abroad/Instructor				
	Online Communications Specialist				
	Coordinator, User Services	David Gregory	FYS, 1 sec LSIM 201	No	
	Career Development Advisor	Megan Boone	FYS, 1 sec; MSU 339; MSU 400	No	-
	Career Coach	Megan Boone	FYS in future		-



Distance Instr. Librarian, Extended Campus & Dual Credit	Tom Kmetz	FYS, 1 sec; LSIM 101 2 1 cr secs	FYS = no LSIM=yes	LSIM Tom Kmetz
Lib. Assoc. (Inst. Serv.) (B)	Tom Kmetz	COMS 108 2 sec		Tom Kmetz
Instructor of History/Military Initiatives Director/Instructor/Facilitator/Instructor of Career and Technical Education/CTE Coordinator				
Space System Eng / Research Design	Eric Jerde		No	
Research Engineer	Eric Jerde		No	
space science antenna engineer	Eric Jerde		No	
research scientist	Eric Jerde		No	
Space sys emg	Eric Jerde		No	
Instruscor / Space science engineering	Eric Jerde		No	
(listed under Jami Hornbuckle but name supplied by Jim Shaw)		SOC 203, 1 sec fall		
		ART109, 1 sec; ART 205 1 sec fall		
		ART160 1 sec fall		
		FYS 1 sec fall only		
	Layne Neeper	COMS108 1 sec fall only	No COMS eval	
TV Station	Layne Neeper	Varies	No, only staff eval	
Field and Clincial experience coodeinatoire	Kim Nettleton	FYS 1 sec fall only	No	